

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,036,091 to Nguyen ("*Nguyen*") in view of U.S. Patent No 6,819,344 to Robbins ("*Robbins*"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,717 to Vayda et al. ("*Vayda*").

By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 5, and 7, and add new claims 11-14. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-14 are now pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, and *Vayda*. *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, and *Vayda* do not teach or suggest the subject matter of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for displaying an electronic equipment input state on a menu screen, including "highlighting an icon corresponding to an operation, the highlighted icon surrounded by a second ring that is of a smaller diameter than the first ring, wherein the first ring and the second ring are different levels of a hierarchical menu," "automatically centering the selected icon on the picture screen," and "enlarging and adding detail to the second ring upon centering the selected icon." The cited references do not teach or suggest at least the claimed "second ring."

With respect to Figure 12, *Robbins* discloses wheel 326 around a segment 328 of helical path 320. Wheel 326 provides data associated with segment 328, for example, programming available at a time corresponding to segment 328. *Robbins*, col. 10, lines 30-51. However, *Robbins*'s wheel 326 and segment 328 are not "different levels of a hierarchical menu," as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Moreover, *Robbins*'s wheel 326 does not constitute or suggest the claimed "second ring." *Robbins*'s wheel 326 is not "of a smaller diameter . . . than the first ring,"

as recited in claim 1. Instead, *Robbins's* wheel 326 has a similar diameter as helical path 20. *Robbins*, Figure 12.

Furthermore, *Robbins's* system does not disclose “enlarging and adding detail to” wheel 326 “upon centering the selected icon,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Instead, *Robbins* discloses growing wheel 326 as it slides around helical path 320 to account for the change in geometry (*Robbins*, col. 9, line 66 to col. 10 line 7), but not “upon centering the selected icon,” as claimed. Moreover, *Robbins's* system is silent with respect to “adding detail to” wheel 326 as it grows. Accordingly, *Robbins's* wheel 326 fails to teach or suggest the claimed “second ring.”

Nguyen and *Vayda* fail to cure the deficiencies of *Robbins*. *Nguyen* and *Vayda* fail to teach or suggest “highlighting an icon corresponding to an operation, the highlighted icon surrounded by a second ring that is of a smaller diameter than the first ring, wherein the first ring and the second ring are different levels of a hierarchical menu,” “automatically centering the selected icon on the picture screen,” and “enlarging and adding detail to the second ring upon centering the selected icon,” as recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 1 also recites “automatically centering the selected icon on the picture screen.” On page 3, the Office Action concedes that *Nguyen* and *Robbins* fail to teach or suggest the claimed “centering,” and instead alleges that *Vayda* discloses this feature. Applicants respectfully disagree.

With respect to Figure 12, *Vayda* discloses several concentric region menus (e.g. menu 1240), each with a focus position at the center of the menu. *Vayda*, col. 13, lines 7-12. “A user may snap highlighter 1206 into the focus position of one of the concentric

region menus 1240.” *Id.* at lines 13-15. “Upon selection of the concentric region menu 1240, the entire menu may be moved so that it fits substantially entirely on the screen.” *Id.* at lines 20-23. However, *Vayda* does not teach or suggest “automatically centering” concentric region menu 1240, and instead only discloses moving it within the screen. *Vayda* is silent with respect to a position on the screen to which the concentric region menu 1240 is moved, and therefore, does not disclose the claimed “automatically centering.”

For at least these reasons, *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, and *Vayda* fail to teach or suggest “automatically centering the selected icon on the picture screen,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, and *Vayda* fail to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1.

Independent claim 5, while of different scope than claim 1, distinguishes over *Nguyen*, *Robbins*, and *Vayda* for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 3, 4, and 7-14 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 5.


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 17, 2008

By: 
Fahd Hussein Patel
Reg. No. 61,780
(202) 408-6072